

United States Patent and Trademark Office

ENTTED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Bret. 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 (www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/699,425	10/31/2003	Diame Ellis	PG16044P1151US	3280
32116	16 7590 04:14/2005		EXAMINER	
WOOD, PHI	LLIPS, KATZ, CLAF	SINGH, ARTI R		
500 W. MADISON STREET SUITE 3800		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
CHICAGO, I	L 60661		1771	

DATE MAILED: 04/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/699,425	ELLIS ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Ms. Arti Singh	1771			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1)[Responsive to communication(s) filed on					
2a)[This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This	action is non-final.				
3)	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	ion of Claims					
4)	Claim(s) <u>1-7</u> is/are pending in the application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)	Claim(s) <u>1-7</u> is/are rejected.					
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8)	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.	.			
Application Papers						
9) 又	The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.				
•	The drawing(s) filed on 31 October 2003 is/are:		to by the Examiner.			
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the		-			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* S	see the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	d.			
2) Notic 3) Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date <u>0.3/15/04</u> .	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:				
S Patent and To	adamad Office					

Art Unit: 1771

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 03/15/04 has been considered by the examiner.

Drawings

2. The drawings were received on 10/31/03 have been entered however are not really needed as they represent the method of making the article.

Specification

3. Applicant is reminded of the proper content of an abstract of the disclosure.

A patent abstract is a concise statement of the technical disclosure of the patent and should include that which is new in the art to which the invention pertains. If the patent is of a basic nature, the entire technical disclosure may be new in the art, and the abstract should be directed to the entire disclosure. If the patent is in the nature of an improvement in an old apparatus, process, product, or composition, the abstract should include the technical disclosure of the improvement. In certain patents, particularly those for compounds and compositions, wherein the process for making and/or the use thereof are not obvious, the abstract should set forth a process for making and/or use thereof. If the new technical disclosure involves modifications or alternatives, the abstract should mention by way of example the preferred modification or alternative.

The abstract should not refer to purported merits or speculative applications of the invention and should not compare the invention with the prior art.

Where applicable, the abstract should include the following:

- (1) if a machine or apparatus, its organization and operation:
- (2) if an article, its method of making;

Art Unit: 1771

(3) if a chemical compound, its identity and use;

(4) if a mixture, its ingredients;

(5) if a process, the steps.

Extensive mechanical and design details of apparatus should not be given. Specifically it needs to be one paragraph and less than 150 words.

Double Patenting

4. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

5. Claims 1-7 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over the claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,716,805.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they appear to be obvious variants of one another.

Art Unit: 1771

6. Claims 1-7 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims of copending Application No. 10/737129. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they too appear to be the species version of the current application, and thus are obvious variants of one another.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

8. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. There is no support for the limitation of the "water source" or the specific antimicrobial agent as suggested in claim 3.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 1771

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 11. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over USPN 4,678,704 issued to Fellows.
- 12. U.S. Pat. No. 4,678,704 discloses an impregnated fabric material comprising a fabric substrate, which may be woven or nonwoven (column 1), to which has been bonded an active cationic impregnant and an anionic indicator dye in combination with a further cationic component (column 1 and 2). Nonionic surfactants, chelating agents and fragrances may also be included in the impregnated fabric. Examples of the cationic materials, which are disclosed, are quaternary ammonium compounds, bisguanides and polymeric bisguanide such as polyhexamethylene bisguanide hydrochloride. It should be noted that Fellows teaches this composite to be used as a wipe but does specifically call it a hard wipe and the Examiner views this limitation as intended use. Further it has been held that a recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed article is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed article from a prior art article once the structural and chemical limitations have been met.
- 13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ms. Arti Singh whose telephone number is 571-272-1483. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terrel Morris can be reached on 571-272-1478. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 1771

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ms. Arti Singh Primary Examiner Art Unit 1771

Ars 04/04/05